



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE.	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,562	02/05/2002	Bertrand Chupeau	PF010009	5056

7590 07/25/2005

JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC.
2 INDEPENDENCE WAY
P. O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

LAROSE, COLIN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/067,562

Applicant(s)

CHUPEAU, BERTRAND

Examiner

Colin M. LaRose

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Arguments and Amendments

1. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 12 May 2005, have been entered and made of record.

Drawings

2. The replacement drawing has been received and placed in the file. The drawing is accepted.

Claim Objections

3. In view of Applicant's amendments, the previous claim objections are withdrawn.
4. The following sections of 37 CFR §1.75(a) and (d)(1) are the basis of the following objection:
 - (a) The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.
 - (d)(1) The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description.
5. Claims 1-19 are objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(a) and (d)(1) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

The last line of claim 1 recites, “of the fragments F_i .” As best understood, “ F_i ” only refers to one fragment. Therefore, it appears that the above phrase should be rewritten as “of the fragments F_i and F_j ” to denote that the inverse mean is take of two fragments rather than just a single fragment. Correction and/or clarification of this limitation is required.

Response to Amendments and Arguments

6. Applicant has amended claim 1 to denote that C is a “factor consistent with the inverse of a mean number of pixels of the fragments.” In the Examiner’s opinion, this change is insufficient to distinguish from the previously applied Haris reference.

As stated in the prior Office action, Haris discloses C being equivalent to $(\|R^*_M\| + \|R^*_M\|)$, which is the sum of the cardinality of fragments R_i and R_j . The cardinality of a set is simply the number of elements in the set, therefore $(\|R^*_M\| + \|R^*_M\|)$ represents the aggregate number of pixels in the two fragments.

Applicant argues that this aggregate value of pixels is not consistent with a mean number of pixels. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The mean value of elements between two groups of elements is equivalent to the aggregate number of elements divided by two. Therefore, the aggregate value is equal to the mean value multiplied by a known scalar value. The aggregate and mean values are considered to be *consistent* with each other because they are directly proportional with each other by a factor of two.

The Specification states, “C is consistent with the inverse of a number of pixels” (paragraph [0100]). Then in the next paragraph, the Specification describes how preferably C is the mean value of the two fragments F_i and F_j (paragraph [0101]). The Specification suggests

Art Unit: 2623

that C being “consistent with a number of pixels” means that the value C is directly proportional to a number of pixels and thus may include the mean value of a number of pixels. The converse is also true in that the mean number of pixels is consistent with the aggregate number of pixels. A suggested correction is to denote that “C is the inverse of the mean number of pixels of the fragments F_i and F_j ” rather than C being merely *consistent with* the mean number of pixels.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “Hybrid Image Segmentation Using Watersheds and Fast Region Merging” by Haris et al. (“Haris”).

Regarding claim 1, Haris discloses a method for the fragmentation of images into homogeneous regions, this fragmentation using iterative merges of fragments F_i and F_j (i.e. two regions R_M^{*i} and R_M^{*j}) which are as similar as possible according to at least one selection parameter, this similarity being evaluated by a product $A*B$ of two factors A and B (see equation (12), page 1689), A being consistent with a number of pixels ($A = \|R_M^{*i}\| * \|R_M^{*j}\|$) and B being consistent with the selection parameters ($B = [\mu(\|R_M^{*i}\|) - \mu(\|R_M^{*j}\|)]^2$), characterized in that a merge is performed when the product $A*B*C$ is less than a threshold consistent with the selection parameter, C being a factor consistent with the inverse of a mean number of pixels of

Art Unit: 2623

the fragments ($C = 1 / (\|R_M^{*i}\| + \|R_M^{*j}\|)$, which is directly proportional to the inverse of the mean number of pixels and is therefore consistent the inverse of the mean number of pixels).

Regarding claim 2, Haris discloses that C is proportional to $2/N_m$ where N_m represents a mean size of the fragments F_i , such as a mean number of pixels (i.e. C represent the inverse of the sum of the cardinality of sets R_M^{*i} and R_M^{*j} and is proportional to the inverse of the mean number of pixels).

Regarding claim 3, Haris discloses the selection parameter(s) is (are) at least luminance (i.e. the luminance Y is used in the calculation of B).

Regarding claim 4, Haris discloses that each iterative merge relates only to two neighbouring fragments F_i and F_j ($I(i,j)$ in equation (12) shows that the merge only relates to adjacent regions).

Regarding claim 5, Haris discloses that the factor A is proportional to the claimed equation (i.e. $A = \|R_M^{*i}\| * \|R_M^{*j}\|$, which is proportional to the given equation).

Regarding claim 6, Haris discloses that the size of a fragment is the number of pixels included in this fragment (i.e. the size of each region is the cardinality of the region – that is, the number of pixels in the region).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of .

Regarding claim 7, Haris discloses that the factor B is proportional to $(Y_i - Y_j)^2$, where $(Y_i - Y_j)$ represent the difference between the luminances of each of these two fragments (see equation (12), page 1689).

Haris does not disclose that the U and V components are utilized because Haris' disclosure is in terms of a greyscale image.

Moed discloses an image segmentation system that operates on a color image. In particular, Moed teaching utilizing the YUV color format to segment an image, and the segmentation algorithm involves generating Y, U, and V difference information. See column 4, lines 18-48.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haris by Moed to segment a color image in the YUV format and utilize the squared difference of the U and V channels, since Moed discloses that it is conventional to perform color segmentation on YUV images.

Art Unit: 2623

11. Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Matching Error Based Criterion of Region Merging for Joint Motion Estimation and Segmentation Techniques” by Schütz et al. (“Schütz”) in view of Haris.

Regarding claim 8, Schütz discloses a method of grouping fragments of an image (i.e. regions), characterized in that this grouping uses a model of motion individual to each fragment F_i (§ 3 – the motion M of each region is estimated and used to group, or merge, the regions together), this model of motion is determined with a known error or variance so as to allocate to the fragment created by this grouping one and the same model of motion (§ 4 – the motion of model for each grouped (merged) region is determined with the known mean absolute error (MAE) of the regions previously computed), grouping together at each step of this method the fragments F_i and F_j which minimize a grouping cost proportional to an evaluation of the difference between the models of motion of the two fragments F_i and F_j (§ 3 – the difference in the motion models, M_A and M_B , of two regions, A and B , is determined on the basis of the mean absolute error (MAE); § 4 – the MAEs between each pair of regions are evaluated to determine which adjacent regions exhibit the lowest merging cost, and then those regions whose grouping costs were determined to be smallest are merged).

Schütz discloses that the initial regions are obtained by a spatial watershed segmentation (see § 2).

However, Schütz does not disclose that the initial fragments (regions) are obtained according to the method of claim 1.

Haris discloses the method of spatial segmentation according to claim 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schütz by Haris to create the initial segmentation according to claim 1, since Schütz discloses that the initial segmentation of the regions is accomplished through a spatial watershed segmentation algorithm, and Haris shows that a watershed segmentation that employs the details of claim 1 is a conventional way of spatially segmenting an image into homogeneous regions.

Regarding claim 19, Schütz discloses the stopping condition is given by a minimal threshold (see § 4).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 9-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 9, Schütz does not disclose: (1) that the grouping cost is inversely proportional to a threshold of motion, or (2) that in the absence of any other stoppage test, the grouping is not allowed if the evaluation is greater than this threshold. Rather, Schütz teaches determining the grouping costs between each pair of adjacent regions and merging regions that have a minimal cost (see § 4).

Regarding claim 11, Schütz does not disclose the claimed details of the delta equations that are used to calculate the evaluation of the difference of motion between two fragments.

Regarding claim 18, Schütz is silent to the claimed stoppage test formula.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colin M. LaRose whose telephone number is (571) 272-7423. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au, can be reached on (571) 272-7414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. (After July 15, 2005, the fax number will be changed to (571)-273-8300.) Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2623

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CML
Group Art Unit 2623
10 July 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vikram Bali', written in a cursive style.

VIKKRAM BALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER